

Is the σ meson dynamically generated?¹

Zhi-hui Guo, L. Y. Xiao and H. Q. Zheng

Department of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, P. R. China

Abstract. We study the problem whether the σ meson is generated ‘dynamically’. A pedagogical analysis on the toy $O(N)$ linear sigma model is performed and we find that the large N_c limit and the $m_\sigma \rightarrow \infty$ limit does not commute. The sigma meson may not necessarily be described as a dynamically generated resonance. On the contrary, the sigma meson may be more appropriately described by considering it as an explicit degree of freedom in the effective lagrangian.

The long standing debate on whether there exists a light and broad resonance (for the historical reason named as the ‘ σ ’ meson [1]) has finally come to an end. The Roy equation analysis clearly indicates a light and broad resonance pole located just inside the analyticity domain established from Roy equations [2]. Despite that there may still exist some disputes at technical level on pole locations, Roy equation analysis starts from first principles of quantum field theory and the result on the existence of the σ pole is robust. The very existence of the sigma pole can actually be understood in a simpler, more intuitive and also rigorous way: one writes a dispersion relation for the analytic continuation of $\sin(2\delta_\pi)$ in the $I, J=0, 0$ channel of elastic $\pi\pi$ scattering and use chiral perturbation theory to estimate the background (left hand cut) contribution. In this way one finds that the background contribution to the phase shift ($\sin(2\delta_\pi)$) is negative and concave whereas the experimental data is positive and convex [3]. The difference can only be made up by a pole contribution, according to the standard S matrix theory principle. On the other side, the σ pole location found from different dispersive analyses [2, 4] agree with each other, within error bars, hence proving convincingly the stability of the numerical outputs on the pole location from dispersive analyses. Also the results from dispersive analyses are also in fair agreement with recent experimental determinations [5]. On the other side, dispersive analyses also reveal, in a model independent way, the existence of a light and broad resonance named κ [6, 7], which are again in agreement with the recent experimental determinations [8]. In the partial wave dispersion relation for πK scattering, there exists the circular cut due to un-equal mass kinematics. In Ref. [6], the background contribution is estimated along the outer edge of the circular cut, hence the complicated cut structure inside the circular cut is avoided.

Having firmly established the existence of the light and broad σ and κ , the next important question is what are these resonances? There exist different proposals to explain these resonances. For example, there are tetra quark model [9], linear sigma model at hadron level [10], linear sigma model at quark level [11], and also the ENJL

¹ Talk presented by Zheng at “Quark Confinement and Hadron Spectrum VII”, 2–7 Sept. 2006, Ponta Delgada, Acores, Portugal

model [12]. Also there exists the approach to explain the light scalars as dynamically generated resonances [13]. In Ref. [14] it is observed that since the widths of σ and κ are very large the pole mass and 'line shape' mass are very different quantities, one should be extremely careful when discussing the mass relations between scalars: the tree level mass relations have to be among those line shape masses rather than those pole masses. The mass relations obtained from the extended Nambu Jona-Lasinio lagrangian are discussed and it is argued that the lightest scalars, σ , κ , $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ form a nonet, as the chiral partners of the pseudo-goldstone bosons [14]. The mass relations are crude, but it is expected that they grasp the major characters of the physics underlined. The major difficulty in this approach is to explain the large mass of $f_0(980)$ [14], and more detailed dynamical analysis may be needed [15].

In the approach to consider the lightest scalars as chiral partners of the pseudo-goldstone bosons, one thing remains to be explained is how to understand the approach that the σ and κ are generated dynamically. Owing to the complexity of the problem, we in the following discuss the unitarization approximations to the solvable $O(N)$ σ model. As will be shown later, it will be helpful to understand several difficult issues.

The $O(N)$ linear σ model lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \Phi^T \partial^\mu \Phi - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \Phi^T \Phi - \frac{\lambda}{8N} (\Phi^T \Phi)^2 \quad (1)$$

where $\Phi = (\Phi_1, \Phi_2, \dots, \Phi_N)^T$. The explicit symmetry breaking interaction is characterized by,

$$\mathcal{L}_{S.B.} = v m_\pi^2 \Phi_N. \quad (2)$$

Here we treat the lagrangian as a cutoff effective lagrangian. That is, in our calculation we make the following replacement:

$$\Gamma(\varepsilon) + \ln 4\pi + \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m_\pi^2} \Rightarrow \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{m_\pi^2}. \quad (3)$$

It has been proved that in such a toy model the $[n,n]$ Padé amplitudes reproduce the exact sigma pole location and the K matrix unitarizations are good approximations [16]. Nevertheless, such a nice property is not maintained if the pion fields are expressed in the non-linear representation, since for the latter the chiral expansion series has to be truncated. There are variants of Eq. (1). For example one may make a polar decomposition to the linear lagrangian and recast it into the following form:

$$\mathcal{L}_{polar} = \mathcal{L}^\sigma + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\sigma}{v}\right)^2 (\partial_\mu \vec{\pi} \cdot \partial^\mu \vec{\pi} + \partial_\mu \sqrt{v^2 - \vec{\pi} \cdot \vec{\pi}} \partial^\mu \sqrt{v^2 - \vec{\pi} \cdot \vec{\pi}}) \quad (4)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}^\sigma = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \sigma \partial^\mu \sigma - \frac{1}{2} m^2 (\sigma + v)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{8N} (\sigma + v)^4. \quad (5)$$

One further expands the square root in Eq. (4) when calculating scattering amplitudes. Also one may completely neglect the sigma field in Eq. (4) to get the non-linear sigma model,

$$\mathcal{L}_{NL} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \vec{\pi} \cdot \partial^\mu \vec{\pi} + \partial_\mu \sqrt{v^2 - \vec{\pi} \cdot \vec{\pi}} \partial^\mu \sqrt{v^2 - \vec{\pi} \cdot \vec{\pi}}). \quad (6)$$

Or one integrate out the sigma field at tree level to get the modified non-linear sigma model lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{NL}} = \mathcal{L}_{NL} + \frac{1}{2m_\sigma^2 v^2} [(\partial_\mu \vec{\pi} \cdot \partial^\mu \vec{\pi})^2 - m_\pi^2 \vec{\pi} \cdot \vec{\pi} \partial_\mu \vec{\pi} \cdot \partial^\mu \vec{\pi} + \frac{m_\pi^4}{4} (\vec{\pi} \cdot \vec{\pi})^2]. \quad (7)$$

We have tested various unitarization approximations and the details will be given elsewhere. Here we only briefly discuss the properties of [1,1] Padé amplitudes constructed using $\mathcal{L}_{polar}$, $\mathcal{L}_{NL}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{NL}}$, respectively. Notice that here we work in the cutoff version of effective lagrangian and hence no counter term is needed when one make calculations at 1-loop level. In each amplitude, a pole is found close to or not far from the sigma pole of the original lagrangian Eq. (1). In the case of $\mathcal{L}_{polar}$, the pole found in the unitarized amplitude is not dynamical. For $\mathcal{L}_{NL}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{NL}}$, the poles are called ‘dynamical’. Except these ‘ σ ’ poles being reproduced, there may exist other spurious poles. The spurious pole does not occur in the lagrangian with linearly realized chiral symmetry, hence one may find that the lagrangian with linearly realized chiral symmetry are better for the purpose of unitarization. Another lesson one may learn is that a ‘dynamically generated’ resonance may or may not be truly dynamical. For $\mathcal{L}_{NL}$, the ‘ σ ’ pole is indeed dynamical, but for $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{NL}}$ the ‘ σ ’ pole just regenerates the σ particle being integrated out in the original lagrangian Eq. (1). For the latter case, the σ is, of course, better (or more conveniently) described by explicitly including it in the lagrangian.

The dynamical poles generated from Eq. (6) and Eq. (7) have quite different dynamical properties, however. It is not difficult to check that the pole location of the ‘ σ ’ pole produced by Eq. (6) is $\sqrt{s_p} \propto v = f_\pi \propto \sqrt{N_c}$ and moves to infinity when $N_c \rightarrow \infty$, whereas the pole generated from Eq. (7) behaves as $\sqrt{s_p} \rightarrow m_\sigma$ when $N_c \rightarrow \infty$. Apparently only the latter is correct when simulating Eq. (1). The lesson one may learn from here is that the large N_c limit and the $M_\sigma \rightarrow \infty$ limit do not commute.

O(N) model is only a simple toy model, comparing with the complicated structure of QCD. However one may still learn some useful lessons from above. The Eq. (6) simulates the current algebra non-linear sigma model in reality whereas Eq. (7) resembles $O(p^4)$ chiral perturbation theory lagrangian in reality. In the real situation, Actually similar things happen. The current algebra prediction to the σ pole location [17]

$$\sqrt{s_\sigma} \simeq \sqrt{16i\pi f_\pi^2} \simeq 463 - 463i, \quad (8)$$

which moves to ∞ when $N_c \rightarrow \infty$, may receive important corrections:

$$s_\sigma \simeq \frac{16i\pi f_\pi^2}{1 + 16i\pi f_\pi^2 \Delta}, \quad (9)$$

where $\Delta = \frac{2}{3f_\pi^2}(22L_1 + 14L_2 + 11L_3) \propto O(N_c^0)$. The above expression is obtained from [1,1] Padé approximation in the chiral limit [18]. Hence it was not clear what approximation is made in obtaining Eq. (9). It is however also obtainable using the PKU parametrization form under two assumptions in the large N_c and chiral limit [18]: 1) one pole (the ‘ σ ’ pole) dominance in the s channel, 2) neglecting all resonance exchanges in the crossed channels, which can also be at the leading order in $1/N_c$ expansion. Even

though Eq. (9) is only a rough approximation, we expect it gives the correct N_c dependence of the sigma pole, if the ‘ σ ’ meson contributes to the low energy constants when N_c is large [19]. For more detailed discussion related to the σ pole location in the large N_c limit one is referred to Ref. [18].

Since the ‘ σ ’ meson found in the [1,1] Padé approximation finally falls down to the real axis in the large N_c limit, it is suggested, through the analysis given above, that the ‘ σ ’ meson is a true particle, i.e., the σ meson being responsible for the spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking in the linear realization of chiral symmetry.

Acknowledgement: This work supported in part by China National Natural Science Foundation under grant number 10575002 and 10421503.

REFERENCES

1. N. A. Tornqvist, Talk given at YITP Workshop on Possible Existence of the sigma meson and its Implications to Hadron Physics, Kyoto, Japan, 12-14 Jun 2000, hep-ph/0008135.
2. I. Caprini, G. Colangelo and H. Leutwyler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 132001.
3. Z. G. Xiao and H. Q. Zheng, Nucl. Phys. **A695**, 273(2001).
4. Z. Y. Zhou et al., JHEP 0502(2005)043.
5. E. M. Aitala et al. (E791 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**(2001)770; M. Ablikim et al. (BES Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B598**(2004)149.
6. Z. Y. Zhou and H. Q. Zheng, Nucl. Phys. A775(2006)212; H. Q. Zheng et al., Nucl. Phys. A733(2004)235.
7. S. Descotes-Genon, B. Moussallam, hep-ph/0607133.
8. E. M. Aitala et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 121801(2002); M. Ablikim et al. (BES Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B633**(2006)681; D. V. Bugg, Eur. Phys. J. **A25**(2005)107, Erratum-ibid. **A26**(2005)151; D. V. Bugg, Phys. Lett. **B632**(2006)471.
9. R. L. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. **D15**(1977)267.
10. N. A. Tornqvist, Z. Phys. **C68**(1995)647; N. N. Achasov and G. N. Shestakov, Phys. Rev. **D49**(1994)5779; R. Kaminski, et al., Phys. Rev. **D50**(1994)3154; M. Ishida et al., Prog. Theor. Phys. **99**(1998)1031; D. Black et al., Phys. Rev. **D64** (2001) 014031.
11. M. D. Scadron, F. Kleefeld, G. Rupp, E. van Beveren, Nucl. Phys. **A724**(2003)391.
12. A. A. Osipov, H. Hansen, B. Hiller, Nucl. Phys. A745(2004)81 and reference therein; V. Dmitrasinovic, Phys. Rev. **C53** (1996) 1383.
13. A. Gomez Nicola, J. R. Pelaez, Phys. Rev. **D65**(2002)054009; J. A. Oller, E. Oset, J. R. Pelaez, Phys. Rev. **D59**(1999)074001, Erratum-ibid. **D60**(1999)099906.
14. L. Y. Xiao, H. Q. Zheng and Z. Y. Zhou, talk given at QCD06, Montpellier, France, July 3 – 7, 2006. hep-ph/0609009.
15. See for example V. Baru, J. Haidenbauer, C. Hanhart, Yu. Kalashnikova, A. E. Kudryavtsev, Phys. Lett. **B586**(2004)53.
16. S. Willenbrock, Phys. Rev. **D43**(1991)1710.
17. H. Leutwyler, contributions to MESON2006, hep-ph/0608218.
18. Z. X. Sun et al., hep-ph/0503195.
19. Z. G. Xiao and H. Q. Zheng, hep-ph/0502199, accepted for publication by MPLA.